

Upper Yuba River Studies Program

Nevada City Public Meeting

September 9, 1999
7:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m.

Transcript of Question and Response Session

Participants: Terry Mills – CALFED
Dave Munro – Skippers Cove Marina
Shawn Garvey – South Yuba River Citizens League
Mike Fitzwater – California Sport Fishing Protection Alliance
Tim Feller – Citizens Allied Against Lake Englebright Destruction
Les Nicholson – Nevada Irrigation District
Kevin Goishi – PG&E
Charlie Alpers – US Geological Survey
Bonnie Nixon – Public Affairs Management -- Meeting Facilitator

QUESTION: Why should we take a dam down that saves us from burning 5,400,000 gallons of oil per year and how will that affect the other dams upstream?

ANSWER: It will probably be a gas fired generator that will replace whatever losses of energy or power production that might occur from increased or decreased diversions of in stream flows. I don't think it is a foregone conclusion that the dam will be removed. One of the purposes of the study is to determine if that is a viable alternative or if introduction is a viable alternative. After an answer is reached, a further question of how to get the fish around, over or under that dam to the upper reaches. We will be able to answer that question as a result of this or the next formal study

QUESTION: Since Englebright Dam was constructed to catch debris and sediment, is there an estimate of when the lake will be full of sediment or debris and what steps will be taken when this occurs?

ANSWER: The [Yuba] County Water Agency and Army Corps [of Engineers] look after the sedimentation in the dam. It is proposed that obtaining a quantitative estimate of the sediment trapped there now will allow us to determine the sedimentation rate since 1941. From that rate, projections could be made about future sediment amounts.

QUESTION: State law requires all Bay area dredging tailing to be barged out to sea and dumped because of its mercury content. Will an EIR also require the same for any dam that might be decommissioned?

ANSWER: I don't know.

QUESTION: If a dam were taken down, where does the funding for the removal of contaminated silt come from? This could cost millions or even billions of dollars.

ANSWER: The sediments behind the damn both in terms of the gold and gravel resources will be evaluated so it isn't necessarily wasted material.

ANSWER: There are three critical issues that we need to look at. Is there habitat above Englebright Dam? What level of mercury contamination occurs in the sediment, and what are the economic costs? We don't have answers to those questions right now until the feasibility studies are complete and CALFED has an opportunity to make a reasoned judgment.

QUESTION: Are there any previous studies done by the Corps of Engineers regarding how much sediment or debris has already filled in the lake? Can you tell us any of the results?

ANSWER: I don't believe the Corps has done a formal study. There may be some [depth] soundings that are available, but that information still needs to be gathered.

QUESTION: What is the present plan to deal with the sediment build up at Englebright Dam?

ANSWER: There is no plan right now. Various alternatives will be considered and scoped out as per these preliminary studies.

QUESTION: The rewind on Narrows is a scheduled maintenance type of repair. Why is it being done during the fall run of salmon when it could easily be scheduled during the winter?

ANSWER: This generator that we're rewinding at Narrows II has been in service for 33 years. The rewind is being done not as a time-based replacement, but on predictive maintenance.

We've been testing and tracking the deterioration of this unit to the point where it is now time to rewind it. The listing of both spring run

and steelhead salmon took us by surprise. Yuba County Water Agency owns and operates the plant and PG&E buys power from those two, so we operate very closely together.

We also operate Narrows I powerhouse. The operations there associated with the rewind are not necessarily driven strictly by the rewind. They are driven by the seasonal flow reduction that occurs almost every September unless there is an abnormally high amount of rainfall. In order to get that job done, we have been regularly consulting with them.

We followed our standard procedure for this job, but since the salmon species are now listed the regulatory environment rules have changed which caught us off guard. We have worked out plans with the U.S. Dept. of Fish and Game and the National Marine Fisheries Service to address their needs and concerns. The plan is not foolproof, but we're working under intense scrutiny. There would be biologists out on the river every day to inspect the impacts of any flow change that we make

QUESTION: Does legislation such as SB 496, which is the Wild and Scenic River designation for the south fork, circumvent the Upper Yuba River Studies Program process?

ANSWER: There's no relationship.

QUESTION: No relationship with the wild and scenic?

ANSWER: No.

QUESTION: How does today's listing of spring run salmon as a threatened species affect the Yuba River?

ANSWER: The Yuba River already has a federally endangered species in addition to a State listed species. The Federally listed species was steelhead trout. The State listed species was spring run Chinook salmon. Yesterday's action by the National Marine Fisheries Service also listed spring run Chinook salmon, under the Federal Endangered Species Act, as a threatened species. It isn't a new layer of bureaucracy or controls on the Yuba River, but an emphasis on the dire straits of Chinook salmon within Northern California.

QUESTION: Are there any existing salmon or steelhead populations in the world that have successfully coped with a dam over decades? If so, how?

ANSWER: Actually, I'm not aware of any naturally spawning populations that have done very well. On the Yuba River, the fall run Chinook salmon have benefited from a dam and the opportunity of cool water it provides. The more limited species needing to ascend to the headwaters have not done well. Typically, fall run salmon spawn very low in the river so they have done well in California at Nimbus Dam, Oroville Dam, and Shasta Dam.

QUESTION: I understand these studies are concerning the fish habitat in the river, but I want to ask a question on how the nine-mile long by half-mile wide swath of dead landscape, that would result from draining the lake, would be or restored? Would this be addressed as part of the study?

ANSWER: In our issues we included Englebright Lake as an identified upstream habitat. We're all aware that when reservoirs are lowered during the year very large barren areas surface. Those areas would need to be re-vegetated, but it is difficult because most of the vegetation supporting soils have eroded away. This situation has occurred before and it will most likely be examined in this study.

QUESTION: I understand the need to protect steelhead and other salmon, but I don't understand why the focus is only on removing Englebright. Won't there still be other dams blocking salmon upstream like Bullard's Bar Dam?

ANSWER: Our focus is not on removing dams, we're looking at the feasibility of introducing wild Chinook salmon up the Yuba River. State and Federal agencies are making a concerted effort to try to restore and improve the condition of steelhead and other anadromous fish throughout the Central Valley. North of here on Butte, Deer and Mill Creeks there are strong programs to establish and implement restoration measures protecting spring run Chinook salmon.

These streams also support small populations of steelhead. Currently, the emphasis is not on dam removal but studying the feasibility of a fish habitat above Englebright. This will depend on the degree of mercury contamination currently existing at Englebright.

QUESTION: Is it true that Chinook salmon, steelhead and rainbow trout cannot live together because they have different habitat requirements?

ANSWER: One of the reasons they can coexist is because they do have different habitat requirements, so they don't compete with one another for certain types of habitats.

QUESTION: What is the status on fish ladder construction?

ANSWER: Recently, we've had more experience in California building low type ladders. A few years ago we built a very effective ladder on Butte Creek, but it only has a rise of about 25 to 30 feet. We've had discussions within CALFED to bring in some ladder experts from Alaska or Washington that have a lot of experience in building very high fish ladders to give us an update on technology.

QUESTION: If and when the 30 miles of the river is designated as wild and scenic, what is the increased probability of the Parks Bar Dam being built?

ANSWER: Parks Bar is 10 to 15 miles downstream from the lower edge of the proposed wild and scenic designation area. So if and when that wild and scenic designation is given to the South Yuba River, it would have no impact on the feasibility of Parks Bar Dam.

QUESTION: It was previously mentioned that the commercial fishing industry of Humboldt County needs salmon for their livelihood. Why is the fishing industry considered more important than the logging industry and why not have a 10-year moratorium on commercial fishing to increase salmon numbers?

ANSWER: Over harvesting of salmon is an identified problem, but it isn't the most serious cause of the decline of for any fish species. Rough modeling indicates that if we eliminated ocean harvesting, there would be an increase in fish for several years, but that the downward trend would continue. To restore these particular species, we need an aggressive and effective program that addresses inland, delta, and lower bay habitats, along with our strict harvest regulations.

QUESTION: Can you please name the tributaries that will be studied?

ANSWER: From our Workgroup discussions, we have decided to examine all habitat tributaries, and water flows that could affect both the middle and south fork, and maybe even some streams like Deer Creek that come in below the sections. It will need to be pretty comprehensive in order to provide the necessary information on habitat flows.

QUESTION: Can we name them all?

ANSWER: Yes, I can. For those of you who are interested, there are watershed maps available at our Grass Valley office. The Forest Service also has USGS blueprinting companies that can give you very detailed maps of some tributaries.

QUESTION: Will the CALFED studies program have any affect on the Yuba County Water Agency's possible plan to dam the middle Yuba River at Freeman's Crossing?

ANSWER: It is really hypothetical so we don't know if we have a program or project in the upper Yuba River studies program. In terms of the Ecosystem Restoration Program, if there is still no opportunity to introduce salmon in the upper rivers. It has a very minimally impact on our overall program to restore ecosystem health, it may have an impact on local watershed health.

QUESTION: If it is CALFED's purpose is to get salmon off the endangered species list, why not increase the already flourishing habitats below Englebright without jeopardizing Nevada and Placer County hydropower, recreation, and Jackson Meadows and Lake Spaulding water storage?

ANSWER: One of our issues is down-stream habitat so we have a number of researchers looking at the life history of steelhead [and salmon] in the lower river. Even though we have a lot of information on fall run Chinook salmon on the lower Yuba, including very good population estimates, we don't have similar estimates for steelhead because of their life history and migration schedule. We have crude census survey from interviews with anglers. From that research, we have an idea there may be a fair number of steelhead there, but we really don't have a good estimate. Only the lower river fisheries technical team [Yuba River Fisheries Technical Working Group] is preparing to put together a habitat [restoration] implementation plan for the lower river where we can improve conditions for a variety of anadromous fish.

QUESTION: Why not fish farms? Our forefathers understood the need for water in a growing state. Hatcheries were built to address the impact of dams on fish, and now our hatcheries are so efficient that we're killing fingerlings rather than releasing them. Why would we take down a dam that provides many benefits when California will only continue to grow?

ANSWER: CALFED's perspective on hatcheries or fish farms is that they serve a very important function by mitigating the construction of large dams. We have historical records that indicate for some areas how many fall run Chinook salmon went above Oroville Dam. The Oroville fish hatchery was constructed to mitigate for the loss of that spawning habitat and for the estimated number of fish that would have been produced.

In terms of trying to restore ecosystem health or to protect naturally spawning fish, hatcheries really don't apply. In some areas we're concerned that hatcheries may be too efficient and produce too many fish so when they are released, they could potentially compete with or even out-compete naturally produced fish. In addition, since hatchery fish are cultured, they are somewhat genetically altered. They don't go through the same fitness survival that naturally spawning fish do, enabling even the weak hatchery fish to survive and interbreed with the naturally spawning fish. We think there are many detriments to emphasizing hatchery programs, but they do have a function that will continue.

QUESTION: If these fish are introduced into the upper Yuba River, will this necessitate a much lower river temperature?

ANSWER: That would be a consideration of what the criteria for what water temperature, water quality will be needed for the fish.

QUESTION: With the fall of over 200 plus feet from the dam to the rocks below, how would a young salmon or steelhead survive the impact on its trip back to sea?

ANSWER: A tough Chinook salmon may survive the fall. That's one of the problems we're looking at. There is the opportunity to transport fish above the dam and release them which is relatively easy to do. It will be difficult to come up with technology to capture the young fish before they do go over the dam and then transport them below the dam. It is probably beyond our capability right now.

QUESTION: If there is an infringement of private property rights, who would compensate property owners, as in decommissioning? Who would set the value?

ANSWER: That's one of the key issues I'm concerned with having property on the lake. At a meeting in Olivehurst, CALFED indicated that they would try to establish the current appraised value of property and use that as a baseline. We wanted to study the current baseline and official data of property values. There is a concern on the

appraised value of the property, so some economic analysis needs to be done on land owner compensation due to loss of lakefront property, recreational, and viewshed values.

QUESTION: What mitigation is planned for damages to property owners who currently have Lake Englebright as a view from their home?

ANSWER: I don't think anybody knows at this point. A lot of discussion has been had in the work group about that issue.

It is part of the objective of the studies.

QUESTION: How will you place an economic value on a subjective value like natural capital such as the health of the watershed and social capital such as the value of a more natural ecosystem?

ANSWER: That is something I don't think we can make a decision about. Social and economic value will need an outside expert assessment.

QUESTION: What are the fishes anticipated water export requirements? Please address sales by Yuba County Water Agency and flushing the bay and delta.

ANSWER: In the larger CALFED programs there are some ecological requirements that require certain levels of delta outflow to maintain the health of the entire San Francisco Bay. It may be short by about 400,000 acre-feet and the source of that water has not been determined. CALFED has a very controversial program to identify additional storage sites within Northern and Southern California that could provide water for environmental purposes along with offsetting other losses to agriculture and industry.

QUESTION: What issues and alternatives are being considered for Bullard's Bar Reservoir? Are removal, alteration, discharge for temperature, quality or flows being considered?

ANSWER: The study determined that removal of Bullard's Bar and reintroduction of anadromous fish above Bullard's Bar was probably not feasible to do. However, the study will continue to examine reintroduction up to Bullard's Bar and the impacts on the releases and the operations of the powerhouse there.

QUESTION: On the issue of flood control, you've mentioned that other agency studies are being conducted. Can you tell us what those are, who

will have the final say on these studies, and how the information for these studies will be checked for accuracy?

ANSWER: There have been and still are a number of studies like the Yuba River investigation by the U.S. Army Corps in 1989. There were two more Army Corps Yuba River investigations. One was completed 11 months ago, and another ongoing study with the San Joaquin-Sacramento River Comprehensive Flood Management program, of which the Yuba is an element. Finally there is an ongoing Yuba County Water Agency Supplemental Flood Control Program which I believe is going into Phase II I right now.

QUESTION: How will they be scrutinized?

ANSWER: We scrutinize them.

QUESTION: How does the Yuba County Water District Study proposition of new dams at Freeman's Crossing, Edward's Crossing, Parks Bar or Lower Narrows relate to the studies by CALFED? Will CALFED have jurisdiction over the Yuba County Water District?

ANSWER: CALFED does not have jurisdiction over the Yuba County Water Agency. CALFED has taken a very careful look at additional storage. From our perspective, building dams on flowing streams at this time is not environmentally benign. CALFED's approach is to look at the opportunities to develop off-stream storage in which water is diverted from rivers and put into storage during periods of high flow. We're also looking at the possibility of putting additional water into storage south of the Delta after it's been exported as well as using ground water recharges as a way to store water. The idea of looking at damming any of the major rivers really doesn't fall within any of CALFED's consideration at this time.

QUESTION: Please explain the contradiction between the purpose and need of this group to restore fisheries, and the Yuba County Water Agency's proposals to build more dams which adds impediments to restoring fisheries?

ANSWER: I think in some respects the Yuba County Water Agency is a water development/flood control agency and consequently, they make their decisions based on that. CALFED is much broader and encompasses a whole variety of issues and concerns. For example, we have a goal of developing additional water supplies but in a different manner. We have flood control but strictly in the Delta by rebuilding Delta levees to protect water quality. We have

a very strong program to restore ecosystem health. The agencies are very true to their missions,

QUESTION: Is the funding for implementation in place and appropriated or will we have to wait even longer to see the beginning of this study? How much will all three phases cost to determine the contents of the studies and implementation? How is this feasibility study project being financed and what is the estimated cost of carrying it to conclusion? How is CALFED's budget funded?

ANSWER: As a joint state and federal agency, CALFED gets funding from both the State government and the Federal government. Right now CALFED has set aside approximately \$500,000 for this program. Feedback indicates that this funding will be inadequate. As we move into Phase II, an important early step will be to further refine those issues and determine a reasonable cost estimate for each of the individual studies. After that we will be able to reassess a more detailed cost analysis. Both the River and Lake Teams have been adamant about funding these studies to the degree necessary to obtain conclusive information. The primary reason is that many stakeholders are being impacted. Phase II's eighteen month period is really short and property owners around the marina and lake will be hurt in the short term because they can't sell their property.

There are companies that have an economic interest, such as PG&E and YCWA, whose actual capital assets are threatened as long as this is part of the dialogue. The River Team represents organizations and communities on the coast of California like Arcata, and Mendocino, where whole communities are losing jobs due to the demise of fishing. Each side has a real interest in not letting this thing drag out.

QUESTION: Why was Englebright Dam built originally and has it possibly outlived its usefulness?

ANSWER: Englebright Dam was originally constructed in the 1940's as a debris control dam for hydraulic mining. What that means is, it was built to stop the silt from water cannons from going down stream. Hydraulic mining had already stopped, but there has been a great deal of silt accumulation behind Englebright Dam although we don't know how much. Englebright is in fact doing what it was designed to do, but it's doing it for a different reason. It has not outlived its usefulness.

QUESTION: Has the study so far included an analysis of what other things lie in the sediment at the bottom of Englebright Lake? We, who have enjoyed the lake for many years, know there are objects like boats, motors, cars, and bodies, below. Have the studies so far included an analysis of what other objects lie in the sediment in the bottom of Englebright Lake?

ANSWER: There have been no studies so far, so there's really no answer to that. Any studies that would be conducted probably would only estimate the volume, take a few samples, but would be statistically unlikely to find any of those objects.

QUESTION: In the discussions regarding water shortages and water supply, I have not heard conservation mentioned. Los Angeles has been very successful by not needing an increase in water supply over the last ten years though the population has increased 30%. Is conservation a consideration during this study?

ANSWER: The district stores 250,280 acre-feet of water. The requirement is 160,000 acre feet of that water for all uses in the district. When I started to work for NID thirty years ago, the requirement was a 148,000 acre feet of water. All water districts are already required to practice conservation. As far as the water supply impacts, until we really know what those are, water conservation practices cannot be determined. Drought year impacts may alter the criteria and outcome, so we are unable to understand the full impacts on water supply.

QUESTION: Milton Reservoir is located at the headwaters of the middle fork of the Yuba River. What increased water flows from Milton Reservoir would be needed to maintain favorable steelhead and salmon conditions?

ANSWER: Milton is not at the headwaters of the middle fork of the Yuba River. The middle fork extends up into English Meadows about 14 miles above Jackson Meadows Reservoir. Until we know what the full requirements are going to be for the species targeted, we can't answer that. The scope of the whole watershed must be examined, not just Jackson Meadows but also releases in the south Yuba Canal, or South Yuba River.

QUESTION: Did I hear the panel say that you don't know whether or not an Environmental Impact Report would be required before you might remove Englebright? If you don't know that, who does?

ANSWER: Any major project will require an Environmental Impact Statement in the NEPA/CEQA process.

QUESTION: Can you define NEPA/CEQA?

ANSWER: The National Environmental Policy Act and the California Environmental Quality Act require assessments for major projects. So certainly, if there is any major action taken, there would be the appropriate environment documents containing appropriate endangered species consultations. At this point, we're just doing the very preliminary feasibility studies to see if there's a project that we can identify that could be implemented.

QUESTION: What is your definition of a stakeholder?

ANSWER: A simple definition of stakeholder is someone that has an interest in or is affected by an action or item.

QUESTION: Does anybody want to add to that?

ANSWER: Determining stakeholders is a learning process. There are 33 million stakeholders in the State of California which makes discussing these issues very difficult. Everyone has different needs, so the goal is to rebalance a system while meeting everyone's needs.

QUESTION: I am quite impressed with the study groups. Is CALFED adequately compensating members for their time?

ANSWER: All the members of these work groups are volunteers.

QUESTION: Why is this process so important?

ANSWER: Early in this study the process was not moving forward due to lack of communication. We have a very unique opportunity to receive funding and perform scientific and objective studies, collaborate with people who can find answers in an open and public process without restriction. At this time, it is not a political process and we have by been able to get through some of the original frustration.

Fortunately, we have a very good facilitator who keeps us on track. We are breaking historic ground by actually sitting here and talking together because there are many extreme opinions about salmon, steelhead, dams, and rivers.

This process has led from nine months ago in Penn Valley where people were scared and emotional. If we go nowhere with this process, there will be many losses. But simply by sitting here and listening to one another and developing relationships, is getting us closer to the end.

We know what this dialogue has done. For a long time it was divisive and it was harmful. Communities are being devastated and we're representing species that can't speak for themselves. We're often asked how much is a fish worth, and I'm not sure. Probably between \$2 and \$9 a pound, but it goes beyond that to the belief that if our ecosystems can't support life then we have a problem. We're trying to be part of that solution.

You know SYRCL went down and met with Bruce Babbitt in Los Angeles to talk about this. I had never even seen Englebright when we said, "Take it down". Since then I've met Dave and I've met a lot of you. I know why people here are connected to Englebright. SYRCL was founded to stop a dam at Edward's that would flood Washington because people were connected to a place. I'm really appreciative that everyone has been so patient.

The reason that we're here tonight is that CALFED made a promise to address some Workgroups after they studied the issues. We want to have all the issues identified so that we can make a judgment on where we go from here. The real threat was the Endangered Species Act and politics. CALFED was going to perform studies without our participation, so it was in our best interest to become involved so we can identify all the issues and get public feedback for Phase I.

QUESTION: Will this study be able to make changes or improvements to the manner in which existing structures are operated? Will the recommendations be enforced or only suggested to the operators and who will enforce or support the findings or suggestions?

ANSWER: I think this is a question that is Phase IV or Phase V. There are no regulatory requirements to do anything that we're doing so far. As we go through the feasibility studies, we need to make agreements on operations. There are probably existing mechanisms that could be employed.

QUESTION: How will this study interact with the Bay/Delta Study? How can the Bay/Delta portion continue, or even begin until the upper watershed studies are complete? If this study was to show or expose problems that are detrimental to the upper watershed and

needed to be connected, would this not affect the Bay/Delta Study findings?

ANSWER: I'm not quite sure what the intent was but the CALFED Bay/Delta program is basically the Bay/Delta Study. There are a lot of agencies involved in gathering scientific data but the overall program right now is being guided by CALFED. We have a very strong program in the Delta and in the upper watersheds. The very early stages of CALFED for the next several years will emphasize habitat restoration in the lower system, particularly in the Delta. However, at the same time we will develop a very strong science program to correct habitat problems that we're aware of in the upper watershed. Particularly tributaries that support salmon and steelhead. I think they're well integrated and will be further integrated within the next 18 months.

QUESTION: Why did the Sacramento Bee urge the Governor and California Senators to get more involved in the direction of CALFED?

ANSWER: Many people feel that a successful CALFED solution is the only solution we will have for decades to come. There's been a lot of effort and trust between the major players including environmental interests, urban water users, and agricultural water users. There is agreement that the CALFED program can probably provide solutions to a lot of major problems, so and I think some of the editorials were encouraging local individuals and politicians to get involved and support the CALFED program.

QUESTION: The Citizens Allied Against Lake Englebright Destruction do not believe there is enough representation of property owners or recreational users affected by Englebright Lake in the Workgroup process. Can the Workgroup process be opened up so that the public and press can have more direct involvement?

ANSWER: Personally I've never felt that we will remain as small of a group as we are now. After we finish our public meetings and start our next set of Workgroup meetings, we will need to review Workgroup composition and how we incorporate any missing representatives into the Workgroup.

When the individual teams meet, we may need to talk very candidly about the issue, but we will discuss opening up the full Workgroup meetings for public and media involvement. I will need advice from CALFED lawyers as to what are our legal requirements within this area. None of us are elected officials in terms of the Brown Act, but people follow some of the discussions that are going on.

QUESTION: Does anyone participating in these study groups conclude that CALFED will recommend what they want after they have worn out all the team members with these interminable meetings?

ANSWER: This process is developing and changing. I don't think CALFED will do that. They have a process here that is working. I expect that after every series of public meetings we will change further.

It's important to remember we're in a preliminary stage. This has not been successfully done before. We hear many people who state they are without representation. Terry, Shawn and Dave have been asked to make this process work. We should have learned from the Penn Valley meeting that three or four hundred people in a room is not a process that works.

One of the things that we're being very cautious about is that Dave and Shawn have absolute equal representation. The agency can have as many people as it wants because it has a lot of expertise that none of us have. We are working on a consensus basis, meaning we can work out problems and come up with dialogue that we can all agree to, no matter what side of the issue we stand on. CALFED did not participate in formatting these agreements. Shawn and Dave formatted these agreements to obtain the primary goal of consensus.

The options are to either take the item off the table; modify it and bring it back for consensus; or, if all else fails, then we go to vote. Terry doesn't get a vote. Only Shawn's team and Dave's team get a vote. These things have taken a lot of time and consideration.

QUESTION: Who or what agencies will conduct the field work for these studies?

ANSWER: Right now, we don't know. We will either have a competitive bid or use people who already are on an existing agency contract, but it's an issue that will be discussed early in Phase II.

QUESTION: Will Englebright eventually have to be torn down anyway as a result of the sediment or mercury contamination?

ANSWER: There hasn't been a formal study and nobody knows the answer.

QUESTION: If one key issue is weighed more heavily than other issues, it might cause a different course of action than if all the issues were

weighed fairly and equally. How are you dealing with this in the study teams?

ANSWER: What will happen now is that the Workgroup will to be exposed to experts. We're going back to this collaborative process. We know that the first thing we have to study is habitat. Is there, in fact, sustainable habitat? If there isn't, we won't go any further.

We need the experts to tell us what to study and how to create this study, and then we as a group will either agree or have some more discussions with those people. We've also discussed parameters. We know that anybody who is a member of the Workgroup or a team member will not receive any money to do a study. We know that no company that only works for government agencies, only works for power companies or only works on fish restoration projects is going to be the recipient of any of these study dollars. We are working to make sure that the words scientific, objective, and thorough have meaning.

I'm not sure about our exclusion of people working on the Workgroup, because we do have a number of agencies that have the technical capability to do some of the studies. We probably don't want to exclude them just because they are participating. The USGS is a recognized authority in some areas and does work for both sides of the river as well as above and below.

QUESTION: The most heavily impacted group of all is the fishing industry. Why aren't they represented?

ANSWER: They are represented on the River Team. The commercial fishermen are represented by Zeke Grader's group [Pacific Coast Federation of Fishermen's Association] and Mark Reisner is his representative. In fact, we are going to Oakland for our next meeting, so they'll have a chance to voice their opinions. Is the commercial fishing interests the point of that question?

QUESTION: Yes, the fishing industry.

ANSWER: I represent the sport fishing industry. It's sport fishing, but it also has commercial aspects to it. We have Trout Unlimited that represents the sport fishing interests as well. Rance Broda is part of the local fly fishing club. So fishing interests are very well represented, both sport fishing and commercial.

QUESTION: Has CALFED funded any entities to buy property or are they considering purchasing property around Lake Englebright?

ANSWER: CALFED has no plans to purchase property around Englebright. CALFED has been trying and successfully acquiring delta lands to be converted to shallow water habitat. We've supported the upper Sacramento River Advisory Council and provided money so they could buy conservation easements for riparian lands along the Sacramento River. CALFED does have the opportunity to purchase land, but we're not particularly looking anywhere on the Yuba River or above Englebright.

QUESTION: You've mentioned fish ladders in other states that deal with greater dam and stream elevations. Are there any European or other foreign models? Please summarize any such fish ladder results?

ANSWER: I know very little about foreign fish ladders, but I do believe there are some Finnish or Norway ladders that are very steep paths and can get fish up very high. I don't know what the maximum elevation is. I'm not sure that we've successfully passed fish over a height of 230 feet in the Western United States, but it's something we really need to look at.

We're starting the fall run of the wild salmon right now above and below Park's Bar, which is the Route 20 crossing over the lower Yuba going down to Marysville. You can see wild salmon down there. Daguerre Dam is about a 26 or 28 foot dam. It has fish ladders on both sides. Those fish ladders are marginally effective. It depends on your perspective because the lower Yuba River sustains one of the largest wild fall run Chinook salmon runs in the Central Valley.

The ladder there is very ineffective and at times allows very few salmon up and over the dam. Go out there and see it for yourself. It's five miles below the Route 20 crossing and you can call SYRCL [South Yuba River Citizens League], CSPA [California Sportfishing Protection Alliance], or Trout Unlimited and ask them to boat you down there.

FACILITATOR: I think that will complete the evening. Again we want to remind you that in the newsletter and in the materials you have are the CALFED website, phone number, and address. We encourage you to use them, stay in contact, and communicate your concerns and issues. We will keep you informed of any additional progress. We will also be sending out another newsletter soon summarizing all these results. Thank you for the time that you've taken tonight to be here. Have a good evening.

* * *